

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXVII.

AUGUST, 1891.

NEW LIGHT ON THE JEWISH QUESTION.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L.

THE rising of the native populations of northern and eastern Europe against the Jews continues to increase in extent and in horror. From Germany, Russia, Austria, and the Danubian principalities it has spread to the Ionian Islands. In Russia, where the government takes the lead, the movement has assumed a form which calls forth general cries of indignation and pity. There are symptoms of a sympathetic movement even in France. The anti-Semitic revolt is, in fact, one of the great features of the age. Yet most of those who talk and write about it seem to mistake its nature and its cause.

The general belief has been that the anti-Semitic movement is religious, and that the Jews are being persecuted, as they were, or are assumed to have been, in the middle ages, on account of their faith. Such was the tenor of all the manifestoes, speeches, and editorials in which British indignation against Russia found vent after the anti-Semitic disturbances of 1880. Everybody said that the dark ages had come again, and that the murderous atrocities of mediæval fanaticism were being reënacted in the nineteenth century.

Now, persecution is not the tendency of the Russian or of the church to which he belongs. The Eastern Church, while it has

NOTE.—A reply to this article, from the Hebrew point of view, will appear in a future number of THE REVIEW —EDITOR NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

VOL. CLIII.—NO. 417. 9

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved,

been superstitious and torpid, has always been tolerant, and, compared with other orthodox churches, free from the stain of persecution. It has not even been proselytizing, nor has it ever sent forth crusaders. Stanley, in his "Eastern Church" (p. 34), dilates upon this characteristic of the Eastern Christians. He says that "a respectful reverence for every manifestation of religious feeling has withheld them from violent attacks on the rights of conscience and led them to extend a kindly patronage to forms of faith most removed from their own"; and he notices that the great philosophers of antiquity are honored by portraits in their churches as heralds of the gospel. Mackenzie Wallace, who is the best authority, while he admits the inferiority of the Russian priests in learning, testifies strongly to their innocence of persecution, saying that "they have neither that haughty intolerance which characterizes their Roman Catholic brethren nor that narrow-minded, bitter, uncharitable sectarian spirit which is too often to be found among Protestants," and that "they allow not only to heretics, but also to members of their own communion, the most complete intellectual freedom, and never think of anathematizing any one for his scientific or unscientific opinions." The educated classes he represents as generally indifferent to theological questions. The peasantry are superstitious and blindly attached to their own faith, which they identify with their nationality; but they think it perfectly natural and right that a man of a different nationality should have a different religion. In the great fair of Nizni-Novgorod the Mohammedan mosque and the Armenian church stand side by side with the orthodox cathedral. At one end of a village is the church, at the other the mosque, and the Mohammedan spreads his prayer-carpet on the deck of a steamer full of orthodox Russians. The Czar is practically, though not theoretically, head of the church as well as of the state; he is the chief of Holy Russia, and in the interest rather of national unity than of religious orthodoxy he restrains proselytism. Nicholas was the most rigorous of Czars, and the most bent on the enforcement of uniformity. Yet Mackenzie Wallace tells a pleasant story of his commending the Jewish sentinel who had conscientiously refused to return the Czar's Easter salutation.

Assuredly the Russian government has never been guilty of anything like the persecutions of Philip II., Ferdinand of Aus-

tria, or Louis XIV. That the Jews have had liberty of worship and education, the existence of 6,319 synagogues and of 77 Jewish schools supported by the state, besides 1,165 private and communal schools, seems clearly to prove.* A Roman cardinal, before he flings his stone at the Russian Church for persecuting the Jews, should think of the records of his own church and look into the Encyclical which he holds in his hand.

After the last anti-Semitic disturbances in Russia, and when the vials of British wrath had been fully poured forth upon the Czar and his people, the British consuls at the different places in Russia at which disturbances had taken place were directed to report on them to the government. Their reports are comprised in two blue books (1881), into which few probably took the trouble to look at the time, but which every one who undertakes to deal with this question and pass judgment on the conduct of the Russian Government and people ought to make a point of reading.

From the consuls we learn, in the first place, that, though the riots were deplorable and criminal, the Jewish accounts published in the London *Times* were in most cases exaggerated, and in some to an extravagant extent. The damage to Jewish property at Odessa, rated in the Jewish account at 1,137,381 rubles, or, according to their higher estimates, 3,000,000 rubles, was rated, Consul-General Stanley tells us, by a respectable Jew on the spot at 50,000 rubles, while the consul-general himself rates it at 20,000. At Elizabethgrad, instead of whole streets being razed to the ground, only one hut had been unroofed. Few Jews, if any, had been intentionally killed, though some died of injuries received in the riots. The outrages on women, of which, according to the Jewish accounts, there had been a frightful number—no less than thirty in one place and twenty-five in another—and by which public indignation in England had been most fiercely aroused, seem, after inquiries by the consuls, to have been reduced to something like half a dozen authenticated cases in all. This is the more remarkable because the riots commonly began with the sacking of the *vodka* shops, which are kept by the Jews, so that the passions of the mob must have been inflamed by drink. The horrible charge brought by the Jews in *The Times* against the Russian women, of having incited the men to outrage their Jewish sisters and held the Jewesses down, to punish them for their

* "Statesman's Year-Book," 1891, pp. 854-856.

superior finery in dress, is found to be utterly baseless. The charge of roasting children alive also falls to the ground. The Jewish pamphlet reprinted from the London *Times* states that a Jewish innkeeper was cooped in one of his own barrels and cast into the Dnieper. This turns out to be a fable, the village which was the alleged scene of it being ten miles from the Dnieper and near no other river of consequence. The Russian peasant is entitled to justice. As a rule, though ignorant and often, thanks to the Jewish vodka shop, intemperate, he is good-natured. There was much brutality, but not the fiendish atrocity which marks the risings of the populace of Paris. For the belief that the mob was "doing the will of the Czar"—in other words, that the government was at bottom of the rising—there does not appear to have been a shadow of foundation. The action of the authorities was not in all cases equally prompt. At Warsaw the commandant held back, though as Lord Granville, the British ambassador, bears witness, his motive for hesitation was humanity. But numbers of rioters were shot down or bayoneted by the troops, hundreds were flogged, some were imprisoned, and some were sent to Siberia. It was not likely that the Russian Government would encourage insurrection. People of the upper class, fancying that in the agitation was the work of Socialists, would be sure not to sympathize with the rioters. Efforts were made by the government to restore Jewish property, and handsome sums were subscribed for the relief of the sufferers.

A lesson of caution is read us when we see charges so foul as that against the Russian women published in the London *Times* reproduced in an authorized pamphlet and generally accepted. The darkness in which Russia is shrouded exposes her to calumny, against which her government takes little care to defend itself. She is unpopular on account of her despotism, which hitherto she has not been able to help, and for which even now no substitute is proposed by anybody except the Nihilists, who propose a chaos out of which a sterner despotism would spring. She has been hated in England since the Crimean War, which was brought on, not by her, though the Czar behaved unwisely, but by the machinations of Louis Napoleon and Palmerston. Even with regard to her prisons and prison system, for which, as well as for her treatment of the Jews, she is now arraigned, let those who wish to do justice compare with the thrilling narratives of the platform the

work of Mr. Lansdell, an apparently honest and sober writer, who, after thorough inspection on the spot, depicts the Russian prison system as simply like other things in Russia, below the level of advanced civilization, while he vastly reduces the number and sufferings of political exiles. Of these exiles, many, it must be remembered, are members of a murder-club which assassinated the emancipator of the serfs. When the quarrel is Jewish, more than usual caution is required, since the press of Europe is to a great and increasing extent in the hands of Jews.

The most important part of the evidence given in the consuls' reports, however, is that which relates to the cause of the troubles. At Warsaw, where the people are Roman Catholics, there appears to have been a certain amount of passive sympathy with the insurgents on religious grounds. But everywhere else the concurrent testimony of the consuls is that the source of the agitation was economical and social, not religious. Bitterness produced by the exactions of the Jew, envy of his wealth, jealousy of his ascendancy, combined in the lowest of the mob with the love of plunder, were the motives of the people for attacking him, not hatred of his faith. Vice-Consul Wagstaff, who seems to have paid particular attention to the question and made the most careful inquiry, after paying a tribute to the sober, laborious thrifty character and the superior intelligence of the Jew, and ascribing to these his increasing monopoly of commerce, proceeds :

"It is chiefly as brokers or middle-men that the Jews are so prominent. Seldom a business transaction of any kind takes place without their intervention, and from both sides they receive compensation. To enumerate some of their other occupations, constantly denounced by the public: they are the principal dealers in spirits; keepers of 'vodka' (drinking) shops and houses of ill-fame; receivers of stolen goods; illegal pawnbrokers and usurers. A branch they also succeed in is as government contractors. With their knowledge of handling money, they collude with unscrupulous officials in defrauding the state to vast amounts annually. In fact, the malpractices of some of the Jewish community have a bad influence on those whom they come in contact with. It must, however, be said that there are many well-educated, highly-respectable, and honorable Jews in Russia, but they form a small minority. This class is not treated upon in this paper. They thoroughly condemn the occupations of their lower brethren, and one of the results of the late disturbances is noticed in the movement at present amongst the Jews. They themselves acknowledge the abuses practised by some of their own members, and suggest remedial measures to allay the irritation existing among the working classes.

"Another thing the Jews are accused of is that there exists among them a system of boycotting; they use their religion for business purposes. This

is expressed by the words 'koul,' or 'kagal,' and 'kherim.' For instance, in Bessarabia, the produce of a vineyard is drawn for by lot, and falls, say, to Jacob Levy; the other Jews of the district cannot compete with Levy, who buys the wine at his own price. In the leasing by auction of government and provincial lands, it is invariably a Jew who outbids the others and afterwards relets plots to the peasantry at exorbitant prices. Very crying abuses of farming out land have lately come to light and greatly shocked public opinion. Again, where estates are farmed by Jews, it is distressing to see the pitiable condition in which they are handed over on the expiration of the lease. Experience also shows they are very bad colonists.

"Their fame as usurers is well known. Given a Jewish recruit with a few rubles' capital, it can be worked out, mathematically, what time it will take him to become the money-lender of his company or regiment, from the drummer to the colonel. Take the case of a peasant: if he once gets into the hands of this class, he is irretrievably lost. The proprietor, in his turn, from a small loan gradually mortgages and eventually loses his estate. A great deal of landed property in south Russia has of late years passed into the hands of the Israelites, but principally into the hands of intelligent and sober peasants.

"From first to last, the Jew has his hand in everything. He advances the seed for sowing, which is generally returned in kind—quarters for bushels. As harvest time comes round, money is required to gather in the crops. This is sometimes advanced on hard conditions; but the peasant has no choice; there is no one to lend him money, and it is better to secure something than to lose all. Very often the Jew buys the whole crop as it stands in the field on his own terms. It is thus seen that they themselves do not raise agricultural products, but they reap the benefits of others' labor, and steadily become rich, while proprietors are gradually getting ruined. In their relation to Russia they are compared to parasites that have settled on a plant not vigorous enough to throw them off, and which is being gradually sapped of its vitality."

The peasants, the vice-consul tells us, often say, when they look at the property of a Jew, "That is my blood." In confirmation of his view he cites the list of demands formulated by the peasants and laid before a mixed committee of inquiry into the causes of the disorder. These demands are all economical or social, with the exception of the complaint that Russian girls in Jewish service forget their religion and with it lose their morals. Everything, in short, seems to bear out the statement of the Russian Minister of the Interior, in a manifesto given in the blue book, that "the movement had its main cause in circumstances purely economical," provided that to "economical" we add "social," and include all that is meant by the phrase "hatred of Jewish usurpation" used in another document.

Vice-Consul Harford, at Sebastopol, is in contact with the Jews of the Crimea, who, he says, are of a superior order, while

some of them are not Talmudic Jews, but belong to the mild sect of the Karaites. He says that in his quarter all goes well.

“The spirit of antagonism that animates the Russian against the Jew is, in my opinion, in no way to be traced to the difference of creed. In this part of Russia, where we have more denominations of religion than in any other part, I have never, during a residence of fourteen years, observed the slightest indication of sectarianism in any class. The peasant, though ignorant and superstitious, is so entirely free from bigotry that even the openly-displayed contempt of the fanatical Mohammedan Crim Tartar for the rights and ceremonies of the Russian Church fails to excite in him the slightest feeling of personal animosity; his own feeling with regard to other religions is perfect indifference; he enters a mosque or synagogue just as he would enter a theatre, and regards the ceremony in much the same manner that an English peasant would, neither knowing nor caring to know whether they worshipped God or the moon. As it is evident from this that race and creed are to the minds of the peasantry of no more consequence than they would be to a Zulu, the only conclusion is that the antipathy is against the usurer, and as civilization can only be expected to influence the rising generation of Russian peasantry, the remedy rests with the Jew, who, if he will not refrain from speculating (in lawless parts of the empire) on ignorance and drunkenness, must be prepared to defend himself and his property from the certain and natural result of such a policy.”

In Germany, in Austria, in Rumania, in all the countries of Europe where this deplorable contest of races is going on, the cause of quarrel appears to be fundamentally the same. It appears to be economical and social, not religious, or religious only in a secondary degree. Mr. Baring-Gould tells us that in Germany “there is scarce a village without some Jews in it, who do not cultivate land themselves, but lie in wait like spiders for the failing Bauer.” A German who knew the peasantry well said to Mr. Gould that “he doubted whether there were a happier set of people under the sun.” But he added, after a pause, “so long as they are out of the clutch of the Jew.” Of the German, as well as of the Russian, it may be said that he is not a religious persecutor. If persecution of a sanguinary or violent kind has ever sullied his annals, the arm of it was the house of Austria, with its Spanish connection, and the head was the world-roving Jesuit. In the case of Hungary, Mr. Paget, who is a Liberal and advocates a liberal policy towards the Jews, says: “The Jew is no less active in profiting by the vices and necessities of the peasant than by those of the noble. As sure as he gains a settlement in a village the peasantry become poor.” “In Austrian Poland,” says a *Times* reviewer, “the worst of the peasant’s

sluggish content is that it has given him over to the exactions of the Jews." "The Jews," he adds, "are in fact the lords of the country." They are lords not less alien to the people than the Norman was to the Saxon, and perhaps not always more merciful, though in their hands is the writ of ejection instead of the conqueror's sword.

Light dawned on the writer's mind on this question when he had just been listening with sympathy to speeches in the British House of Commons on the anti-Semitic movement in Rumania, where, as in Russia, the number of Jews is particularly large and the feeling against them is proportionately intense. The Jewish member who appealed to the government on the subject, and the Foreign Secretary who responded to the appeal had both of them assumed that it was a case of religious persecution, and the Foreign Secretary especially dwelt on the mischievous influence of ecclesiastics; with how little justice, so far as the priests of the Eastern Church are concerned, we have already seen. The debate over, the writer was accosted by his friend the late Dr. Humphrey Sandwith, distinguished for his share in the defence of Kars against the Russians, who knew the Danubian principalities well. Dr. Sandwith said that the speakers had been entirely mistaken; that religion was not the motive of the agitation; that neither the people nor their priests were intolerant; that the government had given aid to a synagogue; but that Jewish usurers got the simple-minded peasants into their toils and sold them out of their homesteads till the peasants would bear it no longer, and an outbreak ensued. Dr. Sandwith, being a thorough-going Liberal, would have been the last man to palliate religious persecution.

In the middle ages intolerance reigned. Christian heretics were persecuted fully as much as Jews, and their case was the harder as they were not voluntary intruders, but natives. The Jew had shown in his persecution of Christianity that he was not less intolerant than the rest. Yet even in the middle ages perhaps the economical and social causes of popular hostility to the Jews had more influence in proportion to the religious cause than is commonly assumed. When the people rise, as at York, they make for the depositaries of the Jewish bonds. The Crusades carried popular fanaticism to its height, but the Jews had probably at the same time increased their social unpopularity by making usurious profits out of the needs of the Crusaders. It was,

moreover, suspected, not without some reason, that the hearts of the Hebrews were on the Oriental side. The clearest as well as the most horrible case of religious persecution was in Spain ; though even in Spain it was a battle of races as much as of creeds, and the Jew suffered partly at least for being the kinsman and suspected ally of the Moor.

The explanation of the whole trouble, and of all the calamities and horrors attending it, past or to come, is that the Jews are, to adopt the phrase borrowed by Vice-Consul Wagstaff from natural history, a parasitic race. Detached from their own country, they insert themselves for the purpose of gain into the homes of other nations, while they retain a marked and repellent nationality of their own. They are not the only parasitic race, though they are incomparably the most important and formidable ; the Armenians, the Greeks of the dispersion, ancient and modern, the Parsis, and even the humble Gypsies, being other instances, while the Lombards in the middle ages and the Italians generally when their country had fallen under foreign dominion showed something like the same tendency. There is, therefore, nothing miraculous or mysterious in their condition.

Whence their parasitism took its rise is a point on which we seem not to be clearly informed. We can only be sure that it had a natural origin. Certainly it was anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem, though it was fixed and perpetuated by that catastrophe. It may have begun with the transplantation to Babylon, and have been extended by the transplantation to Egypt under the Ptolemies. But its principal cause probably was the narrowness of the Jewish territory combined with the love of gain in the Jew. The Hebrew was the near kinsman of the Phœnician, who by the narrowness of his territory and his love of gain was likewise impelled to adventure, and Jewish parasitism is the counterpart, under another form, of that Phœnician colonization which, unlike the nobler colonization of the Greek, was strictly mercantile in its aim. Apparently, there was a religious party in Judea which wished to make the people simple and pious tillers of the soil, and from which emanated the ideal of that polity of husbandmen with hereditary lots and a year of jubilee ascribed by its framers to the great lawgiver of the race. But the trading instinct was too strong. In the stories of the patriarch who bought the birthright of his hungry brother

for a mess of pottage, of the Jewish vizier who taught Pharaoh how to obtain the surrender of all the freeholds of his people by taking advantage of the famine, and of the Hebrews who spoiled the Egyptians by pretending to borrow jewels which they meant never to return, we see the gleamings of a character which was not likely to be content with the moderate gains of a small farming community.

The bond of Judaism and the sustaining cause of Jewish isolation has been the Talmud, a vast collection of legalism, ceremonialism, and casuistry, destined by its minute observances to preserve the purity of the Jew and keep him apart from the impure Gentile. Without this, and the authority of the rabbins based on it, he would probably have in time become as other men and blended with the nations in which he sojourned. Circumcision, above all, the seal of tribalism, perpetuates his isolation. Jerusalem, though lost, and though even the desire of returning to it must have become very faint, acts like the Mohammedan's Caaba as a point for prayer, while the vague hope of a Messiah and of universal dominion helps to sustain the pride and exclusiveness of the tribe. The Mosaic Sabbath and the retention of the Hebrew as a sacred language have completed the barrier of separation. The supposed purity of the race is denied by Renan, who believes that in the earlier wanderings of the Hebrews among the nations of the ancient world mixed elements were taken up. M. Leroy-Beaulieu appears to be of the same opinion.

Jewish exclusiveness would be aggravated by Christian and feudal intolerance; but it is unjust to charge Christendom or feudalism with having impressed upon the Jew an unsocial character, which had already been painted by Roman satire, and had brought the Jew into collision with the communities of the ancient world. However high or rare the gifts of a race may be, if it goes among other races for the purpose of absorbing their wealth by its financial practices, at the same time maintaining its tribal isolation, treating the rest of the community as unclean, refusing to intermarry or to eat with them, and—what is more—dealing with them on the principles of a tribal morality, its unpopularity is a certain consequence. To hold the Jew wholly irresponsible for the evils of an unhappy relation, you must frame an indictment against human nature and mankind.

It is impossible that the expulsion of a multitude of people from the land which has long been their home should not be horrible and heartrending, even though we may suspend our belief as to the gratuitous and fiendish atrocities of which the Russian Government and people are accused. The soul of the civilized world may well be moved by the sight. But the war which we witness is one not of religions, but of races brought by the peculiar tendencies of one of them into relations out of which a conflict was sure sooner or later to arise. The Jew fights with intelligence, while the Russian or Rumanian fights with force ; but this alone is not decisive in favor of the Jew.

The dislike of the Jew and the desire to be rid of him have received a strong impulse, as has been truly said, from that reviving spirit of nationalism which, dating from the rising of the nations against Napoleon, has been fostered by the school of history of which Augustin Thierry was a model, and is showing itself not only in Russia, Germany, Hungary, and Bohemia, but in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. The Jew is now detested not only because he absorbs the national wealth, but because, when present in numbers, he eats out the core of nationality. It is true that all nations are more or less composed of mixed races and have in them, perhaps, some even of the cave-dwellers' blood ; but then the other elements amalgamate and the result is a nation, with which the tribal Jew does not blend. This is not the place for discussing the question between the nation and humanity ; but the tribe, of which Judaism is a survival, is narrower, not broader, than the nation.

Our view of the Jewish question has been hitherto distorted by our theology. On the one hand, the Jew has been absurdly and cruelly held responsible for the death of Christ. On the other, we have accepted the belief that the Jews are a favored race, that the Father of all, like tribal gods, such as Zeus, Brahma, or Wodin, selected a particular tribe, made a covenant with it, and pledged himself, so long as it would serve him, to promote its interests against those of his other children ; that for it he slew all the innocent first-born of Egypt, besides sending a series of horrible plagues upon the helpless subjects of Pharaoh ; that he commissioned it to invade the country of people who had done it no wrong, and to put them and their wives and children to the sword ; and that he stopped the sun in heaven to

enable it to slaughter its flying enemies. We have persisted in reading for edification the account of the slaying of Sisera, and that story of blood over which Jewish tribalism still fiercely exults in its great feast of Purim, including the hanging of Haman's ten sons at the instance of a vindictive Jewess. This we do in the face of the gospel declaration that God made all races of men of one blood to dwell together on the earth. Rational criticism is now happily setting us free and teaching us that the parts of the Old Testament fit for religious use are those which are spiritual and not tribal, such as the higher prophets and most of the Psalms. But we are still in the penumbra of superstition.

A preacher has been heard to say that "a Jew would judge the world." Jesus was a native of the province in which the population was most mixed, and from which, as Pharisaic tribalism thought, no good could come. He called himself the son of man. To Talmudic Judaism his religion, of which the soul is the spontaneity of conscience, forms the most perfect contrast, while it develops and exalts the spiritualism of the prophets and the later school of Hillel. To Talmudic Judaism Christianity has no affinity and owes no debt whatever. The contrast is scarcely less strong between Talmudic Judaism and the philosophic Judaism of the Alexandrian Philo.

In western Europe and in the United States the Jews are comparatively few and scattered; the assimilating forces of an active-minded and highly-educated society are strong; and the integument of Talmudic ice, exposed at once to the rays of an intellectual civilization and to the warm breath of religious equality, has to a great extent given way. The Hebrew has been in part, as his sympathizing friend M. Leroy-Beaulieu tells him he will have to be, "derabbinized and denationalized." Derabbinized he has been so far that the other day some Jews recognized the beneficent character and teaching of Christ, which is certainly a wide departure from the sentiments of the *Toldoth Jesu*. His religion, where he is most derabbinized, appears to be simply theism, with more or less of a lingering conviction that some special mission is reserved by Providence for his race. But it differs from Christian theism. The God of the Jews is one who rewards or punishes, blesses or curses, in this life: worldly prosperity is the sign of his favor; worldly adversity of his wrath. The

Jew pursues present good. As Spinoza says, *Sapientia ejus in vitâ, non in morte est*. He has always been utterly averse from asceticism, the underlying idea of which is the sacrifice of present to future happiness. Self-mortification, like that of a Roman Catholic saint, has, of course, been entirely repugnant to him ; but he also practically rejects the belief common to Christians that the present world is evil and that we must look for our real happiness in another. Such, at least, we gather to be the frame of mind of the more liberal Jew, who in this respect falls in with the practical creed of the agnostic. He seems also on the point of relinquishing his separate Sabbath. He eats and drinks with his Gentile fellow-citizens, nor does he refuse intermarriage with them, though it still seems to go somewhat against the grain, and the marriage of a great Jewish heiress with an English nobleman was understood to be an event far from welcome to the financiers of her tribe. If some of the precepts of the Talmud are still observed by the liberal Jew, it is on sanitary rather than on religious grounds. Among the intellectual Jews of the West there appear to be non-sectarian divisions which, as the isolation of Israel depends on its unity, may be the heralds of social amalgamation.

The derabbinization is far advanced, but the denationalization will not be complete, or anything like complete, till the Jew gives up the tribal rite of circumcision, which must always carry with it tribal sentiment and a feeling of separation from the rest of mankind. The intense love of gain and the addiction to the money trade are ingrained, and it is probable that many generations will pass before the balance of the Hebrew intellect and character is restored by a community of pursuits with other men. Whether any of the tribal morality, the presence of which in the Talmud cannot be denied, still lingers in the mercantile dealings of the Jew, those who are brought into commercial relations with him must decide. He is—indeed, he has always and everywhere been—a conforming citizen, and has refused none of the burdens of the state, though he has made them as light as he could. He adopts also the language of the country in which he lives, reserving that of Judea for the interior of the synagogue. But he changes his country more easily than others. When the Southern Confederacy fell, its leaders generally stood by the wreck and did their best for those whom they had led ; but Judah Benjamin went off to pastures new.

It is also with a certain air of exploitation, the attitude of the cosmopolitan trader, that the genuine Jew takes up any political cause or party. It is impossible that a man should be heartily loyal to two nationalities at once; and so long as a trace of Jewish nationality remains the Jew cannot be a thorough Englishman or American. In fact, when a Jewish question arises in any part of the world, we are made to feel that there is a Jewish interest apart from that of the several nations in which the Jews have their abode. England was made to feel this in her disputes with Russia, and France was made to feel it in the Tunisian expedition. Light, however, would be thrown on this part of the matter if some Jewish authority would tell us distinctly what relation Jewish nationality or the tie of Jewish race bears to the nationality of the country in which the Jew happens to dwell.

The Jew of America and western Europe has not much reason to complain of his present position. In a society of which wealth is the ruling power, his financial skill, sharpened by immemorial practice and aided by the confederacy of his kinsmen, makes him the master of wealth. In Europe patrician pride bows its head before him, and royalty itself is at his feet. The press is rapidly falling under his influence, and becoming the organ of his interests and his enmities. If any hearts still rebel against an ascendancy of the stock exchange and a worship of material success in its least beneficent form, they are so few that they need not be taken into account. Here, in the West, we have no cruel and desperate problem before us. We must allow existing influences to work on, taking care, perhaps, to guard ourselves against commercial combinations, and to look now and then behind the curtain of the press.

It is in eastern Europe and in Russia, where the Jews are massed and where they are still thoroughly Talmudic, that the trouble arises, and the end of it does not seem near. If the quarrel were religious, the preaching of religious toleration might allay it; but we have seen that it is not religious, but economic, social, and national. What the peasant wants is not that Jews should be forcibly converted or that they should be prevented from worshipping in their own synagogues after their own fashion, but that he shall be freed from alien usury and domination. He would hardly desire anything so cruel as the expulsion of the Jews from the land which has long been their home, if it were possi-

ble that their habits and bearing should be changed. But it is not likely that the yoke of the Jew will become less galling, or that the sufferance of the people will increase. Nor are the dense swarms of Russian or Rumanian Jews likely soon to be "derabbinized and denationalized," or to give up their immemorial trades. What will be the result in eastern Europe generally depends on a balance of forces which we have no means of correctly estimating. The governments generally are on the side of the Jew. To repress rioting and maintain order is their duty; while, in the financial state to which they have reduced themselves by their rivalry in military expenditure, they cannot afford to provoke the ire of the money power. The balance of policy inclines the same way. Nihilism is supposed to be partly recruited from the Jews, and their influx into London has been followed, it seems, by a strange development of the low socialistic press; but the notion that the disciples of the Talmud had anything to do with the French Revolution is too absurd for discussion: the party of the prosperous Jew is the party of wealth, and as a rule he is conservative. The Russian Government alone, being intensely national and very uncommercial, takes decidedly the part of its own people. The thanks of all nations will be due to Baron Hirsch, or any other philanthropist, who can find the solution of a problem which now for two thousand years has formed not the least calamitous and piteous part of the annals of humanity.

GOLDWIN SMITH.